

Final Minutes of IHRA Steering Committee Meeting #12
Sunday; May 18, 2003
Uguisu Room
ANA Hotel Grand Court Nagoya
Nagoya, Japan

Attendance

Australia	Keith Seyer
Canada	Ian Noy
EC	Paul Doyle
EEVC	Dominique Cesari
France	Dominique Cesari
Germany	Josef Kunz
	Bernd Friedl
Hungary	
Italy	
Japan	Kenji Wani
	Yoshiyuki Mizuno
	Takashi Hirai
	Nishimoto-san
Poland	Wojciech Przybylski
Sweden	Anders Lie
The Netherlands	Kees Doornheim
	Hans Ammerlaan
United Kingdom	Peter O'Reilly
	Richard Lowne
	Adrian Hobbs
United States	Raymond Owings
	Joseph Kianianthra
	Julie Abraham

AGENDA

Welcoming Remarks

Approval of May 2002 minutes

Working Group Reports

- Side Impact
- Frontal/Compatibility
- Biomechanics
- Pedestrian Safety
- ITS

Status of EDR working group startup

New Business

- Review of IHRA activities for the next 2-year period

Final Minutes from the May 2003 meeting in Japan

<http://www-nrd.nhtsa.dot.gov/IHRA>

Completion of any working group efforts
Start of any new working group efforts
Next Meeting
Adjourn

IHRA Meeting Minutes

Welcoming Remarks:

- Dr. Owings reiterated the importance of IHRA and thanked representatives for attending the meeting. He discussed the ESV Conference in general and the fact that there were over 600 participants, about 240 papers, and 30 exhibitors.
- Joseph Kaniyanthra reminded everybody about the IHRA panel discussion on Thursday. He said that the purpose of the panel discussion is to evaluate what IHRA has accomplished and what could be accomplished in the future.

Minutes of May 2002

- The minutes of the meetings were approved with a slight editorial modification provided by Mr. Mizuno.

Working Group Reports

- The Chairmen of the 5 working groups gave a presentation summarizing the status of the activities of the groups. Their full reports are included in the ESV proceedings CD and can also be found on the IHRA web page, under the Steering Committee page.

Compatibility and Frontal

- Mr. Peter O'Reilly, Chairman of the working group on Frontal Impact /Compatibility, made the presentation. He said that the group has met 7 times since the last ESV.
- Regarding compatibility, he indicated that the group has made good progress and has had good cooperation, in particular regarding front-to-front compatibility. Longer-term front-to-side possibilities would be considered. He indicated that the group would need to reevaluate the speed of its work in light of the high importance of this issue in the U.S. and the need to come up with recommended solutions for the U.S. situation in the near future. He differentiated between the fleet situation and focus of vehicle compatibility between the US/Canada and those in EU and Japan. He indicated that the focus in North America is compatibility between all classes of vehicles in particular that between SUVs/light trucks, which make up a big percentage of the fleet, and smaller passenger vehicles; while EU and Japan are focusing on compatibility between larger vehicles and mini vehicles. He gave a special thank you to Japan for providing the geometric review of differences in height of structures and the average dimensions of the longitudinal members.

- Regarding Frontal Impact, he indicated that the group has come up with 2 frontal tests, which are desirable. All regions are considering ODB and all but Europe have a full width barrier test.

Side Impact

- Keith Seyer, of Australia, presented a report on the progress of the IHRA Side Impact working group. The group has met 7 times since the last ESV meeting.
- He indicated that the target date for a final proposal of a test procedure is the 2005 ESV, with validation in the intervening 2 years. The test procedure will also include a recommendation of the best available dummy, which in all likely scenario would be the WorldSID. He stated that the Side Impact Working Group has not received any recommendations yet from the Biomechanics group.
- Mr. Seyer presented a table highlighting different test devices and the status of testing by various countries and regions. He indicated that there were several conclusions reached by the Working Group: (1) recommendation for the use of MDB-to-vehicle tests involving 2 different MDB types in order to account for regional fleet differences (2) an oblique vehicle-to-pole test (3) out-of-position side airbag evaluation test and (4) sub-systems head impact test.

Biomechanics

- Dr. Ray Owings, of the U.S., presented a brief oral report summarizing the status of the Biomechanics working group. Members of the Steering Committee articulated their concern regarding the progress of the group. He indicated that the group is not meeting regularly and hence has been unable to conclude its recommendations per the schedule put forth for them by the Steering Committee.
- A general request was made by Japan and supported by most representatives regarding asking governments to support and actively seek harmonization of the dummies, as it is extremely important. Many expressed a degree of frustration with the lack of timely recommendations from the Biomechanics Working Group on side impact dummies, including specifications and instrumentation for most relevant body regions and specific dimensions.
- The Steering Committee agreed that while priorities have been set for the Biomechanics Working Group, the group has not succeeded in pursuing the priorities. Therefore, the Steering Committee agreed to revisit the issue by requesting an explanation from the Chair and the Working Group, identifying problems and finding solutions. As a first step, it was also agreed to re-highlight priorities for the group one by one with deadlines for each.

Pedestrian Safety

- Mr. Mizuno, of Japan, provided a status report of the Pedestrian Safety Working Group. He indicated that the group has met 13 times since its inception.
- Mr. Mizuno stated that the group has analyzed detailed information on pedestrian involved traffic accidents and while these types of accidents vary from region to region, the percentages are relatively high and they merit attention. He also stated that given the lack of availability of a practical pedestrian dummy, the group

focused on sub-system test procedures and computer simulation programs, which, at this stage, are more repeatable and could be validated.

- Mr. Mizuno also announced that proposals for head impact subsystem test are completed and that they are now moving to the leg system.
- He also indicated that some countries and regions have begun to introduce regulations in this area (i.e., Japan and Europe). Further, he said that the Working Party on Passive Safety of WP.29 is in the process of developing a GTR in this area. He asked the Steering Committee's approval to provide the GRSP group with info in support of the potential GTR. The committee agreed with Mr. Mizuno's request.
- Finally, Mr. Mizuno made a special request to the U.S. to continue to send an expert to the group meeting.

Intelligent Transport Systems

- Dr. Ian Noy, of Canada, provided a status report of the work of the group. He stated that there were 2 meetings since the last Steering Committee meeting in Washington. He also announced that the new chair of the Working Group is Peter Burns.
- Dr. Noy summarized progress on the various active priority projects.
- He reported that currently there are no plans for rulemaking anywhere in this area. The Working Group has, however, established a formalized cooperation with WP.29, as evident in the establishment of an informal working group under the 1998 Agreement, which is co-chaired by Japan and France. They are now making plans to convene a round table for ITC on Feb. 20, 2004. Therefore, IHRA's research and expertise should help support any future harmonized regulatory development work of WP.29.
- He also reported on the many ITS collaborative activities worldwide (e.g., European active collaborative efforts – Germany/ Sweden / Japan, Transport Canada/NHTSA, speed based methods for interactions with radios and others, Haste, CAMP)
- Brainstorming meeting on how to improve exchange of information on ITS related technologies.

Status of EDR Working Group Startup

- This Working Group was proposed by Canada at ESV 2001 (Amsterdam) because of lack of standardized ways of getting crash information. Canada articulated that work in this area could create better knowledge about the type of crash data needed for researchers.
- The decision was made not to create a Working Group but to encourage countries and regions that are interested in this area to meet informally.
- Everybody agreed that as the technology develops more, there will be data needed that can not be attained without recorders
- Canada and U.S. gave a progress report on activities within their respective jurisdictions.

- Sweden indicated that there are many technical and political issues associated with data collection systems; there is a need for retrofitted stand-alone units, especially with respect to collection of whiplash data. They advocated that researchers worldwide should begin to exchange information on experiences in their own countries.
- Crash rate reduction has been demonstrated in Germany in those vehicles equipped with data recorders, especially for vehicles with professional drivers such as police vehicles, commercial vehicles, etc.
- Japan's study on driving recorder indicates that some legal discussion should be made regarding the possession of the data. However, the system designed only for the evaluation of vehicle function and not for the survey of driver's responsibility may be accepted. Evaluation of not only crashworthiness but also ITS function is very important.
- French representative indicated that France is interested in the subject of data recorders and that a group would facilitate the sharing of experiences and any side effects on global safety. France would like to go further, including a formal presentation of what we know, including work by ISO
- All Steering Committee representatives were interested in keeping it on the agenda of IHRA and agreed that interested parties get together among themselves and keep the Steering Committee informed on the informal deliberation. These countries were Canada, Germany, Japan, Sweden, France, and the U.S. Canada agreed to send a paper around prior to a first meeting.

New Business

EURO NCAP

- Use NCAP testing to find out how safety devices are working (i.e., identify airbag deployment and non-deployment)
- No formal way of reporting information back to EEVC group.

Next Meeting

- November 2003 with WP.29. Find out schedule and decide on date. Dr. Owings reported that Dr. Joseph Kaniyanthra would chair the next Steering Committee meeting. [A request has been received since the Steering Committee meeting to move the data to early December, after the GRSP meeting in Geneva.]

Adjourn

Notes taken by Julie Abraham

Draft minutes compiled and edited by John Hinch

July 17, 2003